

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Applicants thank Examiner Tran for the courtesies extended at the telephonic interview of August 20, 2004 and provide this Statement of the Substance of Interview in compliance with M.P.E.P. 713.04. Independent claim 1 and a proposed amendment thereto (which has been submitted in the present response) were discussed. The Examiner indicated that claim 1 clearly recited the relationship between the polyurethane/polyamide sheet layer and the thermally molded resin layer to each other and the other components of the laminated structure. The Examiner stated, however, that it is unclear from the recitation of the polarizer sheet layer being “held between the two protective sheet layers” as to precisely the relationship between the polarizer sheet layer and the protective sheet layers.

Applicants proposed the present amendment to claim 1 and argued that such an amendment shows the physical relationship of the protective sheet layers and the polarizer sheet layer. Specifically, the present amendment to claim 1 recites that there is a protective sheet layer on each side of the polarizer sheet layer. Although no definitive agreement was reached, Examiner Tran indicated that such claim amendment appears to overcome the indefiniteness rejection under 35 USC 112.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the polarizer sheet layer has two sides and is held between the two protective sheet layers such that there is a protective sheet layer on both sides of the polarizer sheet layer. Applicants submit that such an amendment clarifies the relationship between the polarizer sheet layer and the protective sheet layers and does not add new matter, require a new search, or raise new issues and is therefore proper at this stage of prosecution. Support for the claim amendment can be found in paragraph 34 on page 14.

**Objection to the Specification**

According to the Examiner, the amendments to the specification, specifically the drawings and brief description of the drawings, add new matter. Although Applicants do not agree with this objection and submit that the previously submitted drawings and corresponding

**PATENT**  
**ART UNIT 3731**  
**10/026,295**  
**12301/2**

description are fully supported by the originally filed specification, Applicants have deleted the objectionable sections of the specification to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this objection.

**Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being allegedly indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how the components of the laminated structure are structurally related. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the "polarizer sheet layer has two sides and is held between the two protective sheet layers such that there is a protective sheet layer on both sides of the polarizer sheet layer." Applicants submit that such a claim amendment clearly describes the physical relationship between the polarizer sheet layer and the protective sheet layers. As such Applicants submit that claim 1 (and all claims that depend therefrom) is not indefinite and Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections and objections to the present application have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees or to credit any overpayment associated with the filing of this response to Kenyon & Kenyon's Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Dated: Sept 30 2004

1500 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 220-4200  
Fax: (202) 220-4201

506948

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON



By: Zeba Ali  
(Reg. No. 51,392)